

Detailed Action

In response to correspondence filed on 02/23/2009, claims 44, 45, 50, 62, 64-66, 69 and 72-81 are pending. This office action is made **Final**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 44, 45, 50, 62, 64-66, 69, 72-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rachman et al (US 2002/0182578) in view of Jenkins et al. (US 6,585,519) further in view of "Billy Madison" as supported by "Billy Madison" http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Billy_Madison .

Regarding claims 44, 45, 64, 62, 65 and 72-81, Rachman discloses a system comprising the steps of opening an educational application that includes a plurality of questions pertaining to a subject (e.g. course), answering at least one question (e.g. test) included in the application, providing a link to the user to retrieve additional material (See Abstract and Fig.4B) and receiving a notification from the central site after the answer is provided (See Fig. 4B and 4C). Rachman does not expressly disclose viewing a model removing an article of clothing when the question is answered correctly. However, Jenkins discloses a motivational method for computer-assisted training system wherein periodic reward animations are presented to the user in such a

way that the curiosity of the user to see the rest of the animation further motivates correct response (See Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Jenkins into the system and method of Rachman in order to design a system and method that encourages users to further input correct responses. Rachman/Jenkins do not specifically disclose a human model removing an article of clothing as a reward system. However, such motivational method is well known in the art. The teacher and the bus driver in Billy Madison, the movie, motivate Billy by removing a portion of their clothes for motivating Billy to correctly respond to questions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the system of Rachman/Jenkins to a human model as disclosed by Billy Madison in order to persuade the participants to enter a correct response.

Regarding claim 50, Rachman discloses accessing the central site (e.g. course support system) via a network, opening the educational application on a storage medium (e.g. database) provided by the user (See Fig. 1), opening the educational application that comprises a plurality of questions (See Fig. 4B) and receiving the notification from the system when the answer provided is correct (See fig. 4B).

Regarding claim 70, Rachman does not disclose that the storage medium is CD-Rom. However, the use of CD-ROMs as a storage medium is known in the industry.

Claim 66 discloses means to steps provided in claim 1.

Claim 69 discloses means to perform the steps disclosed in claim 44.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim rejections under 35 U.S.C 103(a) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Banafsheh Hadizonooz whose telephone number is 571-272-1242. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272- 7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BH

/Cameron Saadat/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3715